DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 930 SP 036 613

AUTHOR Weaver, Roberta; Landers, Mary F.
TITLE Preparing Preservice Secondary Teachers for the Diversity Presented by Students with Special Needs.
PUB DATE Feb 96
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; Cultural Differences; Faculty Development; Higher Education; High Risk Students; Practicums; *Preservice Teacher Education; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Secondary Education; *Special Education; Special Needs Students; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Diversity (Student); *Preservice Teachers; University of Dayton OH

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the prevailing atmosphere in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Dayton (Ohio) in 1989 that supported a preservice secondary education teacher coursework change. It also reviews the evolution of the development of the coursework over four years that provided students with experiences causing them to question traditionally held perceptions of the role of the secondary teacher with at-risk and special needs students, and offers a discussion of the insights gained by the faculty implementing the change. The change was brought about by the implementation of a new education program that blocked coursework in educational foundations, human relations, and instructional methods; by the need for preservice education majors to pass a general education portion of the State teacher examination; and by the existence of such a special education needs program in the elementary education program. The block was a full semester, half day, every day morning program for 15 weeks. Students were on campus for 5 weeks, off for 3 weeks, on for 2, off for 3 again, then on to finish for 3 weeks; this rotation permitted integration of theoretical knowledge with hands-on experience. The Human Relations course dealt with diversity in urban settings, differing values, gender issues, and changing demographics and diversity around special needs students and at-risk students. Special education changes were brought about by faculty evaluation, student feedback, and a grant award. The special education component was not only a valuable part of the reflective thinking and growth process of the secondary education students, but it also offered a common ground for the preservice special education teacher and the preservice secondary education teacher. (NAV)

ED 394 930

PREPARING PRESERVICE SECONDARY TEACHERS FOR THE DIVERSITY PRESENTED BY STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Roberta Weaver, Ed.D. and Mary F. Landers, Ed.D.

Department of Teacher Education

University of Dayton

Dayton, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Landers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A Presentation for the 1996 Annual Conference of the

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)

February 21-24, 1996

Chicago, Illinois

SP036613

PREPARING PRESERVICE SECONDARY TEACHERS FOR THE DIVERSITY PRESENTED BY STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

"If America is to educate *all* of its children to higher levels, then Americans must be willing to embrace a major paradigm shift in our beliefs about how students learn. Currently students are required to *adapt* - to adapt to the prevalent teaching practices and instructional materials and assessment instruments used in the school. Those who cannot adapt are rarely accommodated in most classrooms. Instead, they are viewed as being deficient in their ability to learn (Carbo, p. 6)". Carbo's words nicely summarize the driving force behind much of the school restructuring and special education reform efforts; both of which are critical issues for today's educators (Harris & Evans, 1994). As teacher educators, we are challenged with designing preservice teacher preparation programs that produce professionals capable of addressing issues associated with the reform of the American education system (Bunsen, 1990; Logan, 1994).

The particular reform issue being addressed in this paper is the issue of preparing preservice secondary teachers to think differently about their responsibility for educating students at-risk and students with special needs. The paper describes the prevailing atmosphere in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Dayton that supported change, the evolution of the development of the coursework that provided students with experiences causing them to question traditionally held perceptions of the role of the secondary teacher with students at-risk and with students with special needs, and a discussion of the insights gained by the faculty implementing the changes.

Atmosphere Supporting Change

In 1989 the Department of Teacher Education adopted the theme, Teacher as Reflective Decision Maker in a Pluralistic Democracy. Faculty, searching for a supporting conceptual framework to more fully explicate the theme, agreed to establish a Secondary Block Program. It was believed that by BLOCKING coursework in educational foundations, human relations and instructional methods, faculty could better enable students to grasp the relationships among these courses in everyday practice. Specifically, the BLOCK was founded on the belief that quality teachers understand the opportunities and constraints embedded in the society in which they practice (School/Self/Society), that they are skilled in the methodologies associated with quality instruction (Instructional Methods), and that they possess the intra-personal and interpersonal skills and dispositions necessary to effectively interact with self, students, parents, and colleagues (Human Relations).

Another force for change was the need for the preservice secondary education majors to pass the general education portion of the state teacher examination. The professional education portion of the examination assumed a basic knowledge of students with disabilities and the delivery system for those students outlined in the law. The need for this knowledge was, also, voiced by students who had friends in the elementary education program where knowledge of special education students, services and resources was provided.

The relationship of the Human Relations course, in particular, the special education component, of the BLOCK with the other coursework and the evolution of

the class assignments and the field assignments of the Human Relations course are the major focus of the rest of this paper.

Secondary BLOCK and Human Relations

Structure of Block. The BLOCK is designed as a full semester, half day, every day morning program which allows students to take afternoon classes. In a fifteen week semester, the Secondary BLOCK students are on campus for 5 weeks; in the field (Phase I) for 3 weeks; on campus for 2 weeks; in the field (Phase II) for an additional 3 weeks; and finish on campus for 3 weeks. This rotation from campus to field to campus to field and back to campus provides the students and the faculty the opportunity to integrate the theoretical knowledge base with hands-on experiences. Field work in Phase I is dedicated to orienting the preservice student to the secondary school, the content area classroom, the cooperating classroom teacher, the students assigned the cooperating teacher and the instructional materials/resources available for use during Phase II. During Phase II of the field experience, students return to the same school site and assume responsibility for teaching at least one class for the majority of the three weeks.

Human Relations. The Human Relations course consists of two components. One component deals with diversity around urban settings, differing values, gender issues, changing population demographics, etc. The other component deals with diversity around students with special needs (special education) and at-risk students. Students with special needs are defined as those who are identified in the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and who have Individual Education Plans (IEP). Students at-risk are broadly defined as learners who are struggling, for whatever reason, with

the content they are expected to acquire. These two populations are addressed separately, partly because of the specific knowledge base of special education and partly because of the traditional separateness of the special education and the general education certification programs (Kukic, 1989).

Special Education Component of Human Relations

The special education component of the Human Relations portion of the secondary BLOCK has undergone an evolution based on annual faculty evaluation and feedback from students and field-based teachers. It has, also, been influenced by a grant award. Exhibits 1 and 2 outline the four years and highlight specific field-based elements that were addressed each year.

(Insert Exhibits1 & 2 here)

1992-93 Academic Year. Twenty clock hours of BLOCK time was allocated for the special education component of the human relations course. This time was roughly divided with 80% of the time spent as a class with the BLOCK special education faculty member and 20% spent in a "commons problem solving session" with all of the BLOCK instructors. This class represented the first step in providing the secondary preservice teachers with a formal class on special education issues. The over riding goal for the semester was to develop an attitude of capability in the preservice student regarding students with special needs who may be "mainstreamed" into their secondary education content area classes. This attitude of capability was fostered by providing the special education knowledge base each student needed to pass the general education section of the state teacher certification examination; by linking the field-based assignments with the topics discussed in class; by requiring each

preservice secondary education student to compile a mainstreaming resource notebook; and by modeling a problem solving approach to meeting the needs of different learners in the "commons" meetings. The class sessions following Phase I field experience were devoted to discussing observed individual educator attitudes towards students with disabilities and the observed building atmosphere towards students with disabilities (see Exhibit 2) that the preservice student perceived during Phase I; and to discussing strategies for including all students during preservice teacher taught lessons in Phase II. Class sessions following Phase II field experience, utilized a reflective problem solving model to discuss strategies for working with learners who had not performed successfully while the preservice teacher was instructing.

At the end of the term, the students reiterated the value of the knowledge gained and of the assignments made. They indicated that many of the ideas discussed for meeting the needs of students with special learning problems also worked for the students without special needs. They did relate, however, that more information on adapting lessons and providing for individual differences would have been helpful. The special education faculty agreed to place more emphasis on generic lesson adaptations if the content methods instructors would place more emphasis on lesson adaptations specific to their content area.

1993-94 Academic Year. During the second year, the twenty clock hour on-campus class time and the once a week "commons problem solving" sessions remained constant. In class, however, more attention was given to teaching strategies and adaptations for students with special needs. The time devoted to legal aspects of

special education diminished and the time spent on meeting individual learner needs increased. Assignments, such as the resource notebook, article readings and critiques remained the same. In addition, students were required to submit adapted lesson plans used during the Phase II field experience (see Exhibit 2). The adaptations shown were to have been researched and documented. Class presentations of these adapted lessons provided a forum for students to share the relative success of the teaching strategies and materials used with a particular learner or group of learners. Instructor guided class discussion was provided to help the preservice students reflect on their field-based experiences.

There was also some first time interaction with the preservice special education students. These students prepared and presented disability simulations geared toward those common problems (i.e., disorganization, perceptual problems, etc.) faced by high school teachers when working with students with disabilities.

Discussions with the secondary BLOCK students at the close of the term gave rise to the need for a greater interaction with the special education BLOCK students. Both secondary and special education preservice teacher groups felt that the simulation activities provided a wonderful opportunity to note and discuss those issues each would face as practicing educators. Once again the secondary BLOCK students wanted more formal instruction on lesson adaptations and teaching strategies for meeting individual learner needs.

1994-95 Academic Year. The third year saw some dramatic changes in student assignments and field-based activities. First the Department of Teacher Education had been awarded a State level grant to support the preparation of both secondary

education BLOCK students and special education BLOCK students for inclusive education. This grant required teaming the BLOCK students, secondary and special education, with field-based teacher teams in inclusive classrooms. Second the size of the secondary BLOCK doubled (N=41) and the number of special education BLOCK students was low (N=11). Because of these inhibitors, not all secondary BLOCK students could have the same field-based experiences. Approximately one fourth of the secondary BLOCK students were teamed with a special education BLOCK student and with teachers in the field. These teams functioned together throughout the Phase I and Phase II field experiences. The field-based school placements were congruent with the content area of the secondary preservice teacher team member. The other secondary BLOCK students were assigned field-based schools and given assignments similar to those required in the two previous years (see Exhibit 2).

The twenty clock hours of on-campus class time was maintained for all secondary BLOCK students as was the "commons problem solving" sessions; however, the number of class meetings was decreased and the length of in-class time was increased (i.e., five meetings for four hours each; rather than ten meetings of two hours each). For the first time, the special education BLOCK students attended portions of the secondary BLOCK classes and engaged in simulations, analyzes of case studies, and discussions about general educator and special educator teacher roles and responsibilities. In addition, the secondary and special education BLOCK student teams attended training seminars with their field-based teacher teams. These seminars were provided through the grant.

In an attempt to enrich and enlighten all the secondary BLOCK students about teaming, collaboration and inclusion, the secondary and special education BLOCK student teams gave in-class presentations. Presentations included a description of the teaching setting, a description of the students at risk or on IEPs, an example of a lesson conducted with the materials used and, finally, a discussion of the pros and cons of teaming.

This year might be described as the agony and the ecstasy. From the beginning there was frustration among the BLOCK students who had no choice in teaming or not teaming. The selection of students to be team members was driven by the location and existence of inclusive field-based teaming sites. Frustration, regardless of training provided, was apparent among the field-based teacher teams who had never before served as cooperating teachers for a university student team. The university faculty became stressed trying to coordinate and implement two field-based experience models (one inclusive and one traditional) plus being available to support the BLOCK students experiencing frustration. Reflections at the end of the term, however, revealed the value of the teaming experience. Students in the BLOCK teams felt they had a learning experience that provided them with insights about students who learn differently, about teaming and collaboration, and about the process of change that was invaluable. Specifically, it was felt that

- forced teaming, while eventually proving beneficial, did not initially foster team unity. They preferred a choice to participate as a team member,
- interactions with special education BLOCK students in the simulation and case analyzes activities were beneficial,

- meeting only five times for four hour sessions was not frequent enough. More meeting times for shorter periods would help keep special education issues fresh,
- the entire class would have benefited from the activities provided only to the teams involved in the grant activities.

1995-96 Academic Year. The number of secondary BLOCK students was again large (N=44) and the number of special education BLOCK students was less (N= 15). There was no grant money to support field-based teacher training sessions. The BLOCK concept, however, was well established and the BLOCK faculty experienced.

In an attempt to be responsive to the feedback given and the insights gleaned from the previous year's experience and to deal with the limitations associated with numbers of BLOCK students and with lack of grant money, the student activities required in the special education component of the Human Relations course were formulated around the concept of student choice. The students were given a menu of project assignments (see Exhibit 3) and course evaluation options (see Exhibit 4) from which to choose.

(Insert Exhibits 3 & 4 Here)

Each assignment and examination option was explained and students were given three weeks to make their choices. The secondary and special education BLOCK students met in several joint problem solving sessions prior to the secondary students making project choices. Students made the following paper/project choices: Option One - Research Paper (2%); Option Two - Collaboration, Research, and Reflection (45%); Option Three - Collaboration, Interview, and Literature (24%); Option Four - Experiential/Collaboration (29%). For the midterm and final examinations, the

following options were chosen: Option A-Standard Objective and Short Answer tests (17%); Option B - Philosophy of Teaching Explained (48%); and Option C - Case Study Analysis (36%). These options provided the personal experience needed for the students to examine the concept of differentiated assignments, grading and fairness.

The focus of class lectures and discussions were heavily weighted toward problem solving with specific knowledge about disabilities infused as it related to the discussion of a specific learner or a specific situation. Student questions and experiences drove the sharing of teaching strategies and the special education knowledge base rather than a preplanned schedule of topics. Emphasis was on meeting a learner's needs, not on how to serve a student with a specific label. The issue of parental involvement and parent perspective was provided for the first time this year. Also, for the first time, a school psychologist provided information about student assistance teams and training in collaboration and teaming in inclusive programs.

Several formal evaluations were done this year. They were done with both the secondary and the special education BLOCK students and with the field-based teachers who were assigned the student teams in project option 4. The data gathered from the preservice education students indicated the following:

- 82% agreed or strongly agreed that the assignment options were advantageous and appropriate for them,
- 82% agreed or strongly agreed that the secondaty block program contributed to their development as a classroom educator,

- two-thirds of the responses to an open-ended question about the benefits of the secondary BLOCK experience addressed either the special education student interactions or the Human Relations course, and
- those secondary BLOCK students who volunteered to team were disappointed when the special education team partner was not available during the Phase II experience.

The data gathered from the field based teachers indicated the following:

- student teams were a good idea, especially with diverse populations in classrooms
- student teams promoted a sharing of ideas
- field-based teachers needed a clearer understanding of their role with the teams
- student teaming should begin earlier so students would have a greater understanding of teaming by the time they are in BLOCK field experiences

Faculty Insights/Lessons Learned

By all measures the special education component of the Human Relations course has been a valuable part of the reflective thinking and growth process of the University of Dayton preservice secondary education students. It has provided the secondary BLOCK students with experiences and knowledge that each may draw upon as they meet the challenges of student teaching and subsequent employment. It has provided a vehicle for the preservice special educator to gain an understanding of the perspectives secondary educators may have because of long held traditional perceptions of their teaching role and responsibilities. It has helped both the preservice secondary teacher and the preservice special education teacher realize that there is a common ground upon which they can meet.

For the BLOCK faculty, these past four years have provided the following insights:

- It may be more important for the special education-human relations faculty member to co-teach with the various content method faculty in order to facilitate a variety of teaching strategies and lesson adaptations for students with special needs rather than to co-teach with the other human relations faculty member.
- Having students in a cohort BLOCK can be positive in influencing a groupthink, but it can, also be very difficult to abate a non-productive groupthink.
- There is a tendency for the preservice secondary student to feel "less than" the preservice special education student because of the child-centered orientation of the special educator and because of the specialized problem solving knowledge base of the special educator.
- The integration of the preservice training of secondary education students and special education students is imperative for them to be prepared to function in today's schools.
- The preservice secondary student owned the collaboration assignments when the outcome was graded and when the preservice special education student earned credit only for collaboration time and not a grade.
- BLOCK faculty must set aside a regular planning time. This should occur weekly when students are on campus in order to clarify any issues raised by the groupthink syndrome (Janis, 1982).

- Merging a successful secondary teacher training program and special education teacher training program can only be accomplished if faculty value the results of such a merger.

It is evident from the review of the past four years that there are a variety of approaches that seem to be beneficial in preparing the preservice secondary student for addressing the diversity presented by students with special needs, in particular students with disabilities. It is also evident that grant money can be a support, but the program is not dependent upon additional funds. What sustains the BLOCK program and the momentum for change is the faculty whose value system supports the benefits of the BLOCK and an atmosphere within the department that supports student centered learning. "Why not go out on a limb? Isn't that where the fruit is?" (Frank Scully, Forbes)

References

Bunsen, T. D. (1994). Restructuring teacher education: The integration of undergraduate curriculum. In L. M. Bullock & R. L. Simpson, (Eds.). Critical Issues in Special Education: Implications for Personnel Preparation. [Monograph. ERIC Accession Number ED 343332].

Carbo, M. (1995). Educating everybody's children. In R. W. Cole (Ed.), Educating Everybody's Children: Diverse Teaching Strategies for Diverse Learners. (pp. 1-7). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Harris, D. M., & Evans, D. W. (1994). Integrating school restructuring and special education reform. Case In Point, 8, 7-19.

Janis, I. L. (1982). Groupthink (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kukic, S. J. (1989). The effective schools literature is not categorical-Why is certification? Teacher Education and Special Education, 12(4), 177-8.

Logan, D. D. (1994). Shaping secondary teacher training for the 21st century: A practical approach to promoting the success with at-risk students and with mildly disabled special education students in the regular classroom. (A paper presented at the Annual International Meeting of the American Association of University Administrators, Nice, France, September, 1994.) [ERIC Accession Number: ED 384586]

EXHIBIT 1: SPECIAL EDUCATION-HUMAN RELATIONS & FIELD OVERVIEW

Academic Year	Class Size	Focus of Special Education Diversity Component	Field Components Phases I and II
1992-93	22	Awareness of Students with Special Needs; Rationale for inclusion; Current Practices	Phase I: **All** preservice secondary education students did **observations**, became familiar with school, teachers and students. Completed **non-teaching** activities. Phase II: **Implemented** standard lesson in the secondary classroom in which they had observed during Phase I.
1993-94	24	Awareness of Students with Special Needs; Rationale for inclusion; Current Practices; Adaptation Strategies	Phase I: **All** preservice secondary education students did **observations** and **interviews**, becoming familiar with school, teachers, students and issues related to teaching all students, including those at-risk or with disabilities. Completed **non-teaching** activities. Phase II: **Taught** lessons with modifications for at-risk and/or students with special needs in classrooms where they had observed during Phase I.
1994-95 Grant Year	41	Awareness of Needs of Students with Special Needs; Rationale for Inclusion; Lesson modifications; Teaming with preservice Special Education major; shared in-service with field-based teacher.	Phase I: **Three-fourths** of the preservice secondary education students **individually** carried out **non-teaching** assignments in a secondary school classroom. **One-fourth** of the preservice secondary education students were assigned a preservice special education student as a partner. The general education/special education **teams** were assigned to classrooms involved in inclusion of at-risk or students with special needs and with collaboration and teaming being demonstrated by the UD trained field based teachers. Phase II: All preservice secondary students, individuals and teams, **planned and taught** lessons in the classroom where they had observed during Phase I.
1995-96	42	Awareness of Needs of students with Disabilities; Rationale for inclusion; Lesson modifications; Consultation and collaboration with special educators.	Phase I: **Three-fourths** of the preservice secondary education students **individually** carried out **non-teaching** assignments in a secondary school classroom. **One-fourth** of the preservice secondary education students **volunteered** to work collaboratively with a preservice special education student. The secondary/special education **collaborators** were assigned to secondary classrooms involved in inclusion of at-risk or students with special needs to do **observation** and to complete non-teaching assignments. Phase II: All preservice secondary education students **taught** a lesson in the classroom where they had observed during Phase I. Those preservice secondary education students who collaborated with special education majors during Phase I taught a lesson that had been collaboratively planned with special education partner, but the partner was not present.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXHIBIT 2: SPECIAL EDUCATION-HUMAN RELATIONS FIELD ASSIGNMENTS

Academic Year	Field Assignments
1992-93	**All** pre-service secondary education students 1. conducted **interviews** with school PRINCIPAL, REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER, & SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER, 2. examined & critiqued over-all **building atmosphere** concerning students with disabilities, 3. **taught** standard lessons in content area and **critiqued** the performance of students with learning problems.
1993-94	**All** pre-service secondary education students 1. conducted **interviews** with school PRINCIPAL, REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER, & special education teacher, and 2. examined & critiqued over-all **building atmosphere** concerning students with disabilities. 3. **observed** classroom for issues related to teaching at-risk or students with special needs 4. **taught** lesson in content area with modifications for at-risk and students with special needs.
1994-95 Grant Year	**Individual** preservice secondary education students 1. Observations in content area classroom 2. Selected readings based on observations 3. Taught lessons in content area 4. Wrote lesson adaptations to content area lessons based on readings **Teams** of preservice secondary and special education student pairs 1. as a team, they went to secondary education placement congruent with preservice secondary student's content area 2. attended 2-3 training seminars on collaboration, teaming and/or lesson adaptations with their field-based classroom teachers. 3. ascertained through assessment the gifts and needs of students in field-based classroom identified as at-risk or on an IEP, and 4. planned and team taught lessons in content area of secondary student.
1995-96	**All** preservice secondary students did 3 weeks observation and 3 weeks teaching in field-based content area classrooms **Additional** activities were driven by student selected options (**see Exhibit 3**) 1. Library research 2. Case study and library research 3. Campus experiences and reflective paper 4. Collaborating in content area classroom

EXHIBIT 3
SPECIAL EDUCATION-HUMAN RELATIONS

Student Paper/Project Options

Paper/Projects are equal to 60% of grade (40 points/100 point total). There are **four** options:

Option One: (60 points). - Research Paper (Library Research)

Topic: Educational Change and the Impact on Curriculum for Classroom Teachers. [APA writing style; 20 pages; a minimum of 15 citations (no article prior to 1988, unless it concerns PL 94-142 or is an educational classic) Any reference cited prior to 1988 should be included with the paper. (See instructor for any exceptions)].

Option Two: A Two Part Assignment (Case Study and Library Research)

- Part One - Collaboration (45 points)
  Working with one of the Intervention Specialists (a student in the special education block), analyze a case study and a student IEP to develop an intervention plan. Develop 2 objectives (to be implemented in a grading period-9 weeks) in your discipline (field of study) that would make sense. Adaptations for cognitive and social development should be considered. How the student's performance should be evaluated must be included.
- Part Two - Research and Reflection (15 points)
  Write a 5-6 page paper describing how this student with special needs will be included in the class, including such issues as "fairness" of differing assignments and how you would establish respect for diversity (differences) in your classroom. Three to four references are required. A paragraph or two should be included reflecting your experiences with this assignment.

Option Three: A Multiple Dimensions Assignment (Campus Experiences and Reflective Paper)

- Collaborative/Interview Dimension - (30 points)
  1. With an Intervention Specialist (student in special education block), make 3 different Friday observations from 10:00 a.m. to Noon of the high school students with disabilities participating in work experiences/classes on the U.D. campus. Discuss with intervention specialist how work experience would be related to the student's IEP.
  2. Interview a supervisor/teacher of this student ascertaining the positives and negatives of this experience for the student, the university and the teacher/supervisor.
  3. Write a one page reflection paper summarizing the entire experience.
- Interview Dimension - (20 points)

1. Interview Professor Doepker or an associate and/or a student from UD's Mechanical Engineering Technology program regarding their interactions and projects with students with disabilities. Write a one page reflection paper about your experience.
2. Interview Bea Bedard, UD co-coordinator of services for UD students with special needs to ascertain the skills needed by entering first year students that might be addressed in high school programs. . Write a one page reflection paper about your experience and how this might impact your future teaching.

- Literature Dimension - (10 points)
  Identify one issue related through these experiences and read two articles that address the issue. Write a three page paper synthesizing the readings and your experience.

Option Four: An Experiential/Collaboration Project (60 points) (Collaborating in Content Area Classroom)

This project provides opportunities for collaboration between UD students in secondary education and special education.

- During Phase I of the field experience, a secondary major will TEAM with a special education major in the secondary setting. During this time as the secondary student prepares for teaching, the special education student will be observing and participating in the same setting with the secondary student. This collaborative pair (TEAM), with the assistance of the classroom teacher, will select two (2) students who require some intervention to assure success in the classroom. These students should be identified as (labeled) students with special needs OR, in lieu of any identified students with special needs, students who are thought to be at-risk in that classroom/content area.
- The UD students, secondary & special education majors, should design 2 intervention plans (one for each student - special needs or at-risk). Included in each plan should be a brief description of the student's needs, an overview of the class and the specific lesson accommodations to be implemented by the UD secondary student during Phase II.
- There should be a minimum of 2 problem solving sessions between the secondary major and the special education major which should be audio taped (audio tape will be provided). Both students are to critique and reflect on the group process.
- During Phase II, the preservice secondary student will implement the two intervention plans. Following implementation the collaborative pair (TEAM) should meet again to discuss the positives and negatives of the implementation strategies. This session should be audio taped.
- A 3-5 page paper is required. This paper should reflect your growth (successes and failures, attitude changes, etc.) and your overall reaction to collaboration.

EXHIBIT 4
SPECIAL EDUCATION-HUMAN RELATIONS

Midterm and Final: Options A, B, C

Midterm and Final are equal to 40% of grade (40 points/100 point total). Each student selects an option at midterm. Once an option is chosen, that option will be used both at midterm and for the final.

Option A	Option B	Option C
Standard Objective short answer tests. Questions taken from readings, handouts and class lectures.	Written Philosophy of Teaching Midterm - Write your philosophy and discuss how this philosophy translates into classroom practice (i.e., curriculum adaptation, discipline, etc.) for meeting the needs of ALL learners based on class discussions, readings and observations. For the final, this philosophy paper will be revisited, reflecting changes based on class discussions and teaching experiences.	Case Study Analysis Midterm (Collaborative) - Work with a partner from a different academic discipline, if possible. (Your choice, however.) Read a case study and design the adjustments and modifications necessary in your classroom. Final(Independent - A different case study with the same adjustments/ modifications challenge.
20 points Midterm 20 points Final	*20 points Midterm * 40 points total - The initial (midterm) points may be negated and all 40 points awarded for the final paper.	20 points Midterm 20 points Final